

REMARKS

The following remarks are prepared in response to the Office Action mailed May 27, 2004. Claims 12-28 have been canceled without prejudice and claims 29-37 have been added. Claims 1-11 and 29-37 are pending in this application, after entry of this amendment.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kneezel et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,451 hereinafter *Kneezel*). Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 24, and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Zuber et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,196,651 hereinafter *Zuber*) in view of *Kneezel*. Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reexamination.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Independent Claim 1

The rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn as *Kneezel* fails to disclose all the recitations of claim 1 and therefore does not anticipate claim 1.

Focusing now on the specific recitations of claim 1 and the inadequacies of *Kneezel*, claim 1 has been amended to recite: “A replaceable printer component comprising a memory that stores a plurality of fusible bits representing the first resistance.” (Emphasis added).

Claim 1 has been amended to include some of the recitations of claim 2. The Office Action did not reject claim 2 as being anticipated by *Kneezel* and therefore acknowledges the inadequacy of *Kneezel* to disclose a memory that stores a plurality of fusible bits representing the first resistance. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent Claim 1

The rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn as *Zuber* in view of *Kneezel* fail to disclose, teach or suggest all the recitations of claim 1 and therefore does not render obvious claim 1.

Focusing now on the specific recitations of claim 1 and the inadequacies of *Zuber* in view of *Kneezel*, claim 1 has been amended to recite: “A replaceable printer component comprising a memory that stores a plurality of fusible bits representing the first resistance.” (Emphasis added). The plurality of fusible bits are set post-manufacture of the memory. (This application, page 10, Ins. 6-8, emphasis added). With fusible bits, at any point in the product’s life, the fusible bits can be blown with the correct equipment. (This application, page 4, Ins. 13-14).

Zuber fails to teach or suggest a memory for storing a plurality of fusible bits representing the first resistance. That is, *Zuber* does not teach or suggest a plurality of fusible bits capable of being set post-manufacture of the memory. In contrast, *Zuber* requires that the memory be set during manufacture of the memory (*Zuber*, col. 3, Ins. 59-61). Furthermore, combining *Kneezel* with *Zuber* does not teach or suggest the recitations of claim 1 because *Kneezel* does not even mention a memory. Therefore, the inadequacy of *Zuber* is not satisfied by *Kneezel* because neither of these references teach or suggest a replaceable printer component comprising a memory that stores a plurality of fusible bits representing the first resistance. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-11

Claims 2-11 depend from independent claim 1. All of these dependent claims define the replaceable printer component with greater particularity and thus further distinguish over

Kneezel, *Zuber*, and the other references of record. For this reason, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, the rejection of these dependent claims should be withdrawn.

New Independent Claim 29

Claim 29 recites, amongst other things, “an inkjet cartridge comprising a thermal sense resistor coupled to the inkjet printhead and having an adjustable resistance that may be adjusted multiple times.” *Kneezel* and *Zuber* fail to teach or suggest a thermal sense resistor having an adjustable resistance. In both *Kneezel* and *Zuber*, once the resistance is set once at the factory, no further adjustments to the resistance can be made. *Kneezel* discloses that “all adjustments in fractional thermistors and external resistors are made at the factory, and no special measurements or adjustments need to be made for different printheads by the user or the printer” (*Kneezel*, col. 8, lns. 29-32). Similarly, *Zuber* discloses that the thermal sense resistors are set during the manufacturing process (*Zuber*, col. 3, lns. 59-61). Accordingly, claim 29 should be allowable.

Dependent Claims 30-33

Claims 30-33 depend from independent claim 29. All of these dependent claims define the inkjet cartridge with greater particularity and thus further distinguish over *Kneezel*, *Zuber*, and the other references of record. For this reason, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 29, claims 30-33 should be allowable.

New Independent Claim 34

Claim 34 recites, amongst other things, “a printhead comprising a thermal sense resistor having a resistance capable of being adjusted by changing one or more of the plurality of bits stored in the memory device.” In both *Kneezel* and *Zuber*, the resistance is not capable of being adjusted by changing one or more of the plurality of bits stored in the memory device. *Kneezel*

discloses a fusible link shorting bar to set the resistance (*Kneezel*, col. 7, lns. 6-7). *Zuber* discloses that the thermal sense resistors are set during the manufacturing process (*Zuber*, col. 3, lns. 59-61). Hence, *Kneezel* and *Zuber* fail to teach or suggest a thermal sense resistor having a resistance capable of being adjusted by changing one or more of the plurality of bits stored in the memory device. Accordingly, claim 34 should be allowable.

Dependent Claims 35-37

Claims 35-37 depend from independent claim 34. All of these dependent claims define the printhead with greater particularity and thus further distinguish over *Kneezel*, *Zuber*, and the other references of record. For this reason, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 34, claims 35-37 should be allowable.

Conclusion

If there are any questions with regards to this prosecution, or if the Examiner believes that a telephone interview will help further the prosecution of the case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the listed telephone number.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on August 24, 2004.

By: Rachel Carter

Rachel Carter

Signature

Dated: August 24, 2004

Very truly yours,

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

Ketan S. Vakil

Ketan S. Vakil
Registration No. 43,215
1920 Main Street, Suite 1200
Irvine, California 92614-7230
Telephone: (949) 253-4905